arXiv:1401.4946v2 [math.AP] 2 Jul 2014

REGULARITY FOR THE FRACTIONAL GELFAND PROBLEM UP TO DIMENSION 7

XAVIER ROS-OTON

Abstract. We study the problem $(-\Delta)^s u = \lambda e^u$ in a bounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, where λ is a positive parameter. More precisely, we study the regularity of the extremal solution to this problem.

Our main result yields the boundedness of the extremal solution in dimensions $n \leq 7$ for all $s \in (0,1)$ whenever Ω is, for every $i = 1, ..., n$, convex in the x_i-direction and symmetric with respect to $\{x_i = 0\}$. The same holds if $n = 8$ and $s \gtrsim 0.28206...$, or if $n = 9$ and $s \gtrsim 0.63237....$ These results are new even in the unit ball $\Omega = B_1$.

1. Introduction and results

Let $s \in (0,1)$ and Ω be a bounded smooth domain in $\mathbb{R}^n$, and consider the problem

$$\begin{cases} (-\Delta)^s u &= \lambda e^u & \text{in } \Omega \\ u &= 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \backslash \Omega. \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

Here, λ is a positive parameter and $(-\Delta)^s$ is the fractional Laplacian, defined by

$$(-\Delta)^s u(x) = c_{n,s} \mathrm{PV} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{u(x) - u(y)}{|x-y|^{n+2s}} dy. \tag{1.2}$$

The aim of this paper is to study the regularity of the so-called extremal solution of the problem (1.1).

For the Laplacian $-\Delta$ (which corresponds to $s = 1$) this problem is frequently called the Gelfand problem [14], and the existence and regularity properties of its solutions are by now quite well understood [18, 16, 20, 19, 7]; see also [13, 21].

Indeed, when $s = 1$ one can show that there exists a finite extremal parameter λ^* such that if $0 < \lambda < \lambda^*$ then it admits a minimal classical solution u_λ, while for $\lambda > \lambda^*$ it has no weak solution. Moreover, the pointwise limit $u^* = \lim_{\lambda \uparrow \lambda^*} u_\lambda$ is a weak solution of problem with $\lambda = \lambda^*$. It is called the extremal solution. All the solutions u_λ and u^* are stable solutions.

On the other hand, the existence of other solutions for $\lambda < \lambda^*$ is a more delicate question, which depends strongly on the regularity of the extremal solution u^*. More precisely, it depends on the boundedness of u^*.

Key words and phrases. Fractional Laplacian, Gelfand problem, extremal solution.

The author was supported by grants MINECO MTM2011-27739-C04-01 and GENCAT 2009SGR-345.

It turns out that the extremal solution u^* is bounded in dimensions $n \leq 9$ for any domain Ω [19, 7], while $u^*(x) = \log \frac{1}{|x|^2}$ is the (singular) extremal solution in the unit ball when $n \geq 10$. This result strongly relies on the stability of u^*. In the case $\Omega = B_1$, the classification of all radial solutions to this problem was done in [18] for $n = 2$, and in [16, 20] for $n \geq 3$.

For more general nonlinearities $f(u)$ the regularity of extremal solutions is only well understood when $\Omega = B_1$. As in the exponential case, all extremal solutions are bounded in dimensions $n \leq 9$, and may be singular if $n \geq 10$ [4]. For general domains Ω the problem is still not completely understood, and the best result in that direction states that all extremal solutions are bounded in dimensions $n \leq 4$ [3, 24]. In domains of double revolution, all extremal solutions are bounded in dimensions $n \leq 7$ [7]. For more information on this problem, see [2] and the monograph [12].

For the fractional Laplacian, the problem was studied by J. Serra and the author [23] for general nonlinearities f. We showed that there exists a parameter λ^* such that for $0 < \lambda < \lambda^*$ there is a branch of minimal solutions u_λ, for $\lambda > \lambda^*$ there is no bounded solutions, and for $\lambda = \lambda^*$ one has the extremal solution u^*, which is a stable solution. Moreover, depending on the nonlinearity f and on n and s, we obtained L^∞ and H^s estimates for the extremal solution in general domains Ω. Note that, as in the case $s = 1$, once we know that u^* is bounded then it follows that it is a classical solution; see for example [22].

For the exponential nonlinearity $f(u) = e^u$, our results in [23] yield the boundedness of the extremal solution in dimensions $n < 10s$. Although this result is optimal as $s \to 1$, it is not optimal, however, for smaller values of $s \in (0, 1)$. More precisely, an argument in [23] suggested the possibility that the extremal solution u^* could be bounded in all dimensions $n \leq 7$ and for all $s \in (0, 1)$. However, our results in [23] did not give any L^∞ estimate uniform in s.

The aim of this paper is to obtain better L^∞ estimates for the fractional Gelfand problem (1.1) whenever Ω is even and convex with respect to each coordinate axis. Our main result, stated next, establishes the boundedness of the extremal solution u^* whenever (1.3) holds and, in particular, whenever $n \leq 7$ independently of $s \in (0, 1)$. As explained in Remark 2.2, we expect this result to be optimal.

Theorem 1.1. *Let Ω be a bounded smooth domain in $\mathbb{R}^n$ which is, for every $i = 1, ..., n$, convex in the x_i-direction and symmetric with respect to $\{x_i = 0\}$. Let $s \in (0, 1)$, and let u^* be the extremal solution of problem (1.1). Assume that either $n \leq 2s$, or that $n > 2s$ and*

$$\frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{n}{2}\right)\Gamma(1+s)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{n-2s}{2}\right)} > \frac{\Gamma^2\left(\frac{n+2s}{4}\right)}{\Gamma^2\left(\frac{n-2s}{4}\right)}. \tag{1.3}$$

Then, u^* is bounded. In particular, the extremal solution u^* is bounded for all $s \in (0, 1)$ whenever $n \leq 7$. The same holds if $n = 8$ and $s \gtrsim 0.28206...$, or if $n = 9$ and $s \gtrsim 0.63237...$.

The result is new even in the unit ball $\Omega = B_1$.

We point out that, for $n = 10$ condition (1.3) is equivalent to $s > 1$.

Let us next comment on some works related to problem (1.1).

On the one hand, for the power nonlinearity $f(u) = (1+u)^p$, $p > 1$, the problem has been recently studied by Dávila-Dupaigne-Wei [11]. Their powerful methods are based on a monotonicity formula and a blow-up argument, using the ideas introduced in [10] to study the case of the bilaplacian, $s = 2$. For this case $s = 2$, extremal solutions with exponential nonlinearity have been also studied; see for example [8].

On the other hand, Capella-Dávila-Dupaigne-Sire [6] studied the extremal solution in the unit ball for general nonlinearities for a related operator but different than the fractional Laplacian (1.2). More precisely, they considered the *spectral* fractional Laplacian in B_1, i.e., the operator A^s defined via the Dirichlet eigenvalues of the Laplacian in B_1. They obtained an L^∞ bound for u^* in dimensions $n < 2\left(2 + s + \sqrt{2s+2}\right)$ and, in particular, their result yields the boundedness of the extremal solution in dimensions $n \leq 6$ for all $s \in (0,1)$.

Another result in a similar direction is [9], where Dávila-Dupaigne-Montenegro studied the extremal solution of a boundary reaction problem. Recall that problems of the form (1.1) involving the fractional Laplacian can be seen as a local weighted problem in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+$ by using the extension of Caffarelli-Silvestre. Similarly, the spectral fractional Laplacian A^s can be written in terms of an extension in $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}_+$. Thus, the boundary reaction problem studied in [9] is also related to a "fractional" problem on the boundary, in which $s = 1/2$. Although in this paper we never use the extension problem for the fractional Laplacian, we will use some ideas appearing in [9] to prove our results, as explained next.

Recall that the key property of the extremal solution u^* is that it is *stable* [12, 23], in the sense that

$$\int_\Omega \lambda e^{u^*} \eta^2 dx \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left|(-\Delta)^{s/2}\eta\right|^2 dx$$

for all $\eta \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^n)$ satisfying $\eta \equiv 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega$.

In the classical case $s = 1$, the main idea of the proof in [7] is to take $\eta = e^{\alpha u^*} - 1$ in the stability condition to obtain a $W^{2,p}$ bound for u^*. When $n < 10$, this $W^{2,p}$ estimate leads, by the Sobolev embeddings, to the boundedness of u^*. This is also the approach that we followed in [23] to obtain regularity in dimensions $n < 10s$.

Here, instead, we assume by contradiction that u^* is singular, and we prove a lower bound for u^* near its singular point. This is why we need to assume the domain Ω to be even and convex —in this case, the singular point is necessarily the origin. Then, in the stability condition we take an explicit function $\eta(x)$ with the same expected singular behavior as $e^{\alpha u^*(x)}$ (given by the previous lower bound). More precisely, we take as η a power function of the form $\eta(x) \sim |x|^{-\beta}$, with β chosen appropriately. This idea was already used in [9], where Dávila-Dupaigne-Montenegro studied the extremal solution for a boundary reaction problem.

The paper is organized as follows. First, in Section 2 we give some remarks and preliminary results that will be used in the proof of our main result. Then, in Section 3 we prove Theorem 1.1.

2. Some preliminaries and remarks

In this section we recall some facts that will be used in the proof of Theorem 1.1.

First, recall that a weak solution u of (1.1) is said to be stable when

$$\int_\Omega \lambda e^u \eta^2 dx \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left|(-\Delta)^{s/2}\eta\right|^2 dx \tag{2.1}$$

for all $\eta \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^n)$ satisfying $\eta \equiv 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega$; see [23] for more details. Note also that, integrating by parts on the right hand side, one can write (2.1) as

$$\int_\Omega \lambda e^u \eta^2 dx \leq \int_\Omega \eta (-\Delta)^s \eta \, dx. \tag{2.2}$$

We will use this form of the stability condition in the proof of Theorem 1.1.

Next we recall a computation done in [23] in which we can see that condition (1.3) arises naturally.

Proposition 2.1 ([23]). *Let $s \in (0,1)$, $n > 2s$, and $u_0(x) = \log \frac{1}{|x|^{2s}}$. Then, u_0 is a solution of*

$$(-\Delta)^s u_0 = \lambda_0 e^{u_0} \quad \text{in all of } \mathbb{R}^n,$$

with

$$\lambda_0 = 2^{2s} \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{n}{2}\right)\Gamma(1+s)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{n-2s}{2}\right)}. \tag{2.3}$$

Moreover, setting

$$H_{n,s} = 2^{2s} \frac{\Gamma^2\left(\frac{n+2s}{4}\right)}{\Gamma^2\left(\frac{n-2s}{4}\right)}, \tag{2.4}$$

u_0 is stable if and only if $\lambda_0 \leq H_{n,s}$.

We point out that $H_{n,s}$ is the best constant in the fractional Hardy inequality, even though we will not use such inequality in this paper.

Remark 2.2. This proposition suggests that there could exist a stable singular solution to (1.1) in the unit ball whenever $\lambda_0 \leq H_{n,s}$. In fact, we may consider a larger family of problems than (1.1), by considering nonhomogeneous Dirichlet conditions of the form $u = g$ in $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega$. For all these problems, our result in Theorem 1.1 still remains true; see Remark 3.3. In the particular case $\Omega = B_1$ and $g(x) = \log|x|^{-2s}$ in $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_1$, the extremal solution to the new problem is exactly $u^*(x) = \log|x|^{-2s}$ in B_1 whenever $\lambda_0 \leq H_{n,s}$. Thus, when $\lambda_0 \leq H_{n,s}$ we have a singular extremal solution for some exterior condition g.

We expect the sufficient condition (1.3) of Theorem 1.1 to be optimal since it is equivalent to $\lambda_0 > H_{n,s}$.

The condition $\lambda_0 > H_{n,s}$, appeared and was discussed in Remark 3.3 in [23].

We next give a symmetry result, which is the analog of the classical result of Berestycki-Nirenberg [1]. It does not require any smoothness of Ω. From this result

it will follow that, under the hypotheses of Theorem 1.1, the solutions $u_\lambda(x)$ attain its maxima at $x = 0$.

When $\Omega = B_R$, there are a number of papers proving the radial symmetry of solutions for nonlocal equations. For domains which are symmetric with respect to an hyperplane, the following Lemma follows from the results in [15].

Lemma 2.3 ([15])**.** *Let Ω be a bounded domain which is convex in the x_1-direction and symmetric with respect to $\{x_1 = 0\}$. Let f be a locally Lipschitz function, and u be a bounded positive solution of*

$$\begin{cases} (-\Delta)^s u &= f(u) \quad \text{in } \Omega \\ u &= 0 \qquad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \backslash \Omega. \end{cases}$$

Then, u is symmetric with respect to $\{x_1 = 0\}$, and it satisfies

$$\partial_{x_1} u < 0 \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega \cap \{x_1 > 0\}.$$

As said before, this lemma yields that solutions u_λ of (1.1) satisfy

$$\|u_\lambda\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} = u_\lambda(0).$$

This allows us to locate the (possible) singularity of the extremal solution u^* at the origin, something that is essential in our proofs.

Finally, to end this section, we compute the fractional Laplacian on a power function, something needed in the proof of Theorem 1.1.

Proposition 2.4. *Let $(-\Delta)^s$ be the fractional Laplacian in $\mathbb{R}^n$, with $s > 0$ and $n > 2s$. Let $\alpha \in (0, n - 2s)$. Then,*

$$(-\Delta)^s |x|^{-\alpha} = 2^{2s} \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{\alpha+2s}{2}\right) \Gamma\left(\frac{n-\alpha}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{n-\alpha-2s}{2}\right) \Gamma\left(\frac{\alpha}{2}\right)} |x|^{-\alpha-2s},$$

where Γ is the Gamma function.

Proof. We use Fourier transform, defined by

$$\mathcal{F}[u](\xi) = (2\pi)^{-n/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} u(x) e^{-i\xi \cdot x} dx.$$

Then, one has that

$$\mathcal{F}\big[(-\Delta)^s u\big](\xi) = |\xi|^{2s} \mathcal{F}[u](\xi). \tag{2.5}$$

On the other hand, the function $|x|^{-\alpha}$, with $0 < \alpha < n$, has Fourier transform

$$\kappa_\beta \mathcal{F}\big[|\cdot|^{-\beta}\big](\xi) = \kappa_{n-\beta} |\xi|^{\beta-n}, \qquad \kappa_\beta := 2^{\beta/2} \Gamma(\beta/2) \tag{2.6}$$

(see for example [17, Theorem 5.9], where another convention for the Fourier transform is used, however).

Hence, using (2.6) and (2.5), we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}\big[(-\Delta)^s |\cdot|^{-\alpha}\big](\xi) &= |\xi|^{2s} \mathcal{F}\big[|\cdot|^{-\alpha}\big](\xi) \\ &= \frac{\kappa_{n-\alpha}}{\kappa_\alpha} |\xi|^{\alpha+2s-n} = \frac{\kappa_{n-\alpha}}{\kappa_\alpha} \frac{\kappa_{\alpha+2s}}{\kappa_{n-\alpha-2s}} \mathcal{F}\big[|\cdot|^{-\alpha-2s}\big](\xi). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, it follows that

$$(-\Delta)^s|x|^{-\alpha} = \frac{\kappa_{n-\alpha}}{\kappa_\alpha}\,\frac{\kappa_{\alpha+2s}}{\kappa_{n-\alpha-2s}}\,|x|^{-\alpha-2s} = 2^{2s}\,\frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{\alpha+2s}{2}\right)\Gamma\left(\frac{n-\alpha}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{n-\alpha-2s}{2}\right)\Gamma\left(\frac{\alpha}{2}\right)}\,|x|^{-\alpha-2s},$$

as claimed. □

3. Proof of the main result

The aim of this section is to prove Theorem 1.1. We start with two preliminary lemmas.

The first one gives a lower bound for the singularity of an unbounded extremal solution. As we will see, this is an essential ingredient in our proof of Theorem 1.1. A similar result was established in [9] in the case of the boundary reaction problem considered there.

Lemma 3.1. *Let n, s, and u^* as in Theorem 1.1, and assume that u^* is unbounded. Then, for each $\sigma \in (0,1)$ there exists $r(\sigma) > 0$ such that*

$$u^*(x) > (1-\sigma)\log\frac{1}{|x|^{2s}}$$

for all x satisfying $|x| < r(\sigma)$.

Proof. We will argue by contradiction. Assume that there exist $\sigma \in (0,1)$ and a sequence $\{x_k\} \to 0$ for which

$$u^*(x_k) \le (1-\sigma)\log\frac{1}{|x_k|^{2s}}. \tag{3.1}$$

Recall that, by Lemma 2.3, we have $u_\lambda(0) = \|u_\lambda\|_{L^\infty}$. Thus, since u^* is unbounded by assumption, we have

$$\|u_\lambda\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} = u_\lambda(0) \longrightarrow +\infty \quad \text{as} \quad \lambda \to \lambda^*.$$

In particular, there exists a sequence $\{\lambda_k\} \to \lambda^*$ such that

$$u_{\lambda_k}(0) = \log\frac{1}{|x_k|^{2s}}.$$

Define now the functions

$$v_k(x) = \frac{u_{\lambda_k}(|x_k|x)}{\|u_{\lambda_k}\|_{L^\infty}} = \frac{u_{\lambda_k}(|x_k|x)}{\log\frac{1}{|x_k|^{2s}}}, \qquad x \in \Omega_k = \frac{1}{|x_k|}\Omega.$$

These functions satisfy $0 \le v_k \le 1$, $v_k(0) = 1$, and

$$(-\Delta)^s v_k \longrightarrow 0 \quad \text{uniformly in } \Omega_k \text{ as } k \to \infty.$$

Indeed,

$$(-\Delta)^s v_k(x) = \frac{1}{\log\frac{1}{|x_k|^{2s}}}|x_k|^{2s}\lambda_k e^{u_{\lambda_k}(|x_k|x)} \le \frac{\lambda_k}{\log\frac{1}{|x_k|^{2s}}} \le \frac{\lambda^*}{\log\frac{1}{|x_k|^{2s}}} \longrightarrow 0.$$

Note also that the functions v_k are uniformly Hölder continuous in compact sets of $\mathbb{R}^n$, since $|(-\Delta)^s v_k|$ are uniformly bounded (see for example Proposition 1.1 in [22]). Hence, it follows from the Arzelà-Ascoli theorem that, up to a subsequence, v_k converges uniformly in compact sets of $\mathbb{R}^n$ to some function v satisfying

$$(-\Delta)^s v \equiv 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n, \quad 0 \le v \le 1, \quad v(0) = 1.$$

Thus, it follows from the strong maximum principle that $v \equiv 1$.

Therefore, we have that

$$v_k(x) \longrightarrow 1 \quad \text{uniformly in compact sets of } \mathbb{R}^n,$$

and in particular

$$\frac{u_{\lambda_k}(x_k)}{\log \frac{1}{|x_k|^{2s}}} = v_k\left(x_k/|x_k|\right) \longrightarrow 1.$$

This contradicts (3.1), and hence the lemma is proved. □

In the next lemma we compute the fractional Laplacian of some explicit functions in all of $\mathbb{R}^n$. The constants appearing in these computations are very important, since they are very related to the ones in (1.3).

Lemma 3.2. *Let $s \in (0,1)$, $n > 2s$, and $\varepsilon > 0$ be small enough. Then*

$$(-\Delta)^s |x|^{\frac{2s-n+\varepsilon}{2}} = \left(H_{n,s} + O(\varepsilon)\right) |x|^{\frac{-2s-n+\varepsilon}{2}}$$

and

$$(-\Delta)^s |x|^{2s-n+\varepsilon} = \left(\lambda_0 \frac{\varepsilon}{2s} + O(\varepsilon^2)\right) |x|^{-n+\varepsilon},$$

where $H_{n,s}$ and λ_0 are given by (2.4) *and* (2.3)*, respectively.*

Proof. To prove the result we use Proposition 2.4 and the properties of the Γ function, as follows.

First, using Proposition 2.4 with $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}(n - 2s - \varepsilon)$ and with $\alpha = n - 2s - \varepsilon$, we find

$$(-\Delta)^s |x|^{\frac{2s-n+\varepsilon}{2}} = 2^{2s} \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{n+2s-\varepsilon}{4}\right)\Gamma\left(\frac{n+2s+\varepsilon}{4}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{n-2s+\varepsilon}{4}\right)\Gamma\left(\frac{n-2s-\varepsilon}{4}\right)} |x|^{\frac{-2s-n+\varepsilon}{2}}$$

and

$$(-\Delta)^s |x|^{2s-n+\varepsilon} = 2^{2s} \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{n-\varepsilon}{2}\right)\Gamma\left(\frac{2s+\varepsilon}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right)\Gamma\left(\frac{n-2s-\varepsilon}{2}\right)} |x|^{-n+\varepsilon},$$

where Γ is the Gamma function.

Since $\Gamma(t)$ is smooth and positive for $t > 0$, then it is clear that

$$2^{2s} \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{n+2s-\varepsilon}{4}\right)\Gamma\left(\frac{n+2s+\varepsilon}{4}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{n-2s+\varepsilon}{4}\right)\Gamma\left(\frac{n-2s-\varepsilon}{4}\right)} = 2^{2s} \left(\frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{n+2s}{4}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{n-2s}{4}\right)}\right)^2 + O(\varepsilon) = H_{n,s} + O(\varepsilon).$$

Thus, the first identity of the Lemma follows.

To prove the second identity, we use also that $\Gamma(1+t)=t\Gamma(t)$. We find,

$$\begin{aligned}
2^{2s}\frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{n-\varepsilon}{2}\right)\Gamma\left(\frac{2s+\varepsilon}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right)\Gamma\left(\frac{n-2s-\varepsilon}{2}\right)} &= 2^{2s}\frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{n-\varepsilon}{2}\right)\Gamma\left(\frac{2s+\varepsilon}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(1+\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right)\Gamma\left(\frac{n-2s-\varepsilon}{2}\right)}\,\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\\
&= 2^{2s}\frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{n}{2}\right)\Gamma(s)}{\Gamma(1)\Gamma\left(\frac{n-2s}{2}\right)}\,(1+O(\varepsilon))\,\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\\
&= 2^{2s}\frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{n}{2}\right)s\Gamma(s)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{n-2s}{2}\right)}\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2s}+O(\varepsilon^2)\right)\\
&= 2^{2s}\frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{n}{2}\right)\Gamma(1+s)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{n-2s}{2}\right)}\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2s}+O(\varepsilon^2)\right)\\
&= \frac{\lambda_0}{2s}\,\varepsilon+O(\varepsilon^2).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, the lemma is proved. □

We can now give the proof of our main result.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. First, note that when $n\le 2s$ the result follows from [23], since we proved there the result for $n<10s$. Thus, from now on we assume $n>2s$.

To prove the result for $n>2s$ we argue by contradiction, that is, we assume that u^* is unbounded and we show that this yields $\lambda_0\le H_{n,s}$. As we will see, Lemma 3.1 plays a very important role in this proof.

Let u_λ, with $\lambda<\lambda^*$, be the minimal stable solution to (1.1). Using ψ in the stability condition (2.2), we obtain

$$\int_\Omega \lambda e^{u_\lambda}\psi^2 dx\le\int_\Omega \psi(-\Delta)^s\psi\,dx.$$

Moreover, ψ^2 as a test function for the equation (1.1), we find

$$\int_\Omega u_\lambda(-\Delta)^s(\psi^2)dx=\int_\Omega \lambda e^{u_\lambda}\psi^2 dx.$$

Thus, we have

$$\int_\Omega u_\lambda(-\Delta)^s(\psi^2)dx\le\int_\Omega \psi(-\Delta)^s\psi\,dx\quad\text{for all}\quad\lambda<\lambda^*. \tag{3.2}$$

Next we choose ψ appropriately so that (3.2) combined with Lemma 3.1 yield a contradiction. This function ψ will be essentially a power function $|x|^{-\beta}$, as explained in the Introduction.

Indeed, let ρ_0 be small enough so that $B_{\rho_0}(0)\subset\Omega$. For each small $\varepsilon>0$, let us consider a function ψ satisfying

(1) $\psi(x)=|x|^{\frac{2s-n+\varepsilon}{2}}$ in $B_{\rho_0}(0)\subset\Omega$.
(2) ψ has compact support in Ω.
(3) ψ is smooth in $\mathbb{R}^n\setminus\{0\}$.

Now, since the differences $\psi(x) - |x|^{\frac{2s-n+\varepsilon}{2}}$ and $\psi^2(x) - |x|^{2s-n+\varepsilon}$ are smooth and bounded in all of $\mathbb{R}^n$ (by definition of ψ), then it follows from Lemma 3.2 that

$$(-\Delta)^s \psi(x) \leq (H_{n,s} + C\varepsilon)\, |x|^{\frac{-2s-n+\varepsilon}{2}} + C \tag{3.3}$$

and

$$(-\Delta)^s (\psi^2)(x) \geq \left(\lambda_0 \frac{\varepsilon}{2s} - C\varepsilon^2\right) |x|^{-n+\varepsilon} - C, \tag{3.4}$$

where C is a constant that depends on ρ_0 but not on ε.

In the rest of the proof, C will denote different constants, which may depend on ρ_0, n, s, Ω, and σ, but not on ε. Here, σ is any given number in $(0,1)$.

Hence, we deduce from (3.2)-(3.3)-(3.4), that

$$\left(\lambda_0 \frac{\varepsilon}{2s} - C\varepsilon^2\right) \int_\Omega u_\lambda |x|^{\varepsilon-n} dx \leq (H_{n,s} + C\varepsilon) \int_\Omega |x|^{\varepsilon-n} dx + C. \tag{3.5}$$

We have used that $\int_\Omega u_\lambda \leq \int_\Omega u^* \leq C$ uniformly in λ (see [23]). Since the right hand side does not depend on λ, we can let $\lambda \longrightarrow \lambda^*$ to find that (3.5) holds also for $\lambda = \lambda^*$.

Next, for the given $\sigma \in (0,1)$, we apply Lemma 3.1. Since u^* is unbounded by assumption, we deduce that there exists $r(\sigma) > 0$ such that

$$u^*(x) \geq (1-\sigma) \log \frac{1}{|x|^{2s}} \quad \text{in } B_{r(\sigma)}.$$

Thus, we find

$$(1-\sigma)\left(\lambda_0 \frac{\varepsilon}{2s} - C\varepsilon^2\right) \int_{B_{r(\sigma)}} |x|^{\varepsilon-n} \log \frac{1}{|x|^{2s}} dx \leq (H_{n,s} + C\varepsilon) \int_\Omega |x|^{\varepsilon-n} dx + C. \tag{3.6}$$

Now, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{B_{r(\sigma)}} |x|^{\varepsilon-n} \log \frac{1}{|x|^{2s}} dx &= 2s|S^{n-1}| \int_0^{r(\sigma)} r^{\varepsilon-1} \log \frac{1}{r}\, dr \\
&= 2s|S^{n-1}|\, (r(\sigma))^\varepsilon\, \frac{1 - \varepsilon \log \frac{1}{r(\sigma)}}{\varepsilon^2} \\
&\geq \left\{2s|S^{n-1}|\, (r(\sigma))^\varepsilon - C\varepsilon\right\} \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\int_\Omega |x|^{\varepsilon-n} dx \leq |S^{n-1}| \int_0^1 r^{\varepsilon-1} dr + C = |S^{n-1}| \frac{1}{\varepsilon} + C.$$

Therefore, by (3.6),

$$(1-\sigma)\left(\lambda_0 \frac{\varepsilon}{2s} - C\varepsilon^2\right) \left\{2s|S^{n-1}|\, (r(\sigma))^\varepsilon - C\varepsilon\right\} \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} \leq (H_{n,s} + C\varepsilon)\, |S^{n-1}| \frac{1}{\varepsilon} + C.$$

Hence, multiplying by ε and rearranging terms,

$$(1-\sigma)\lambda_0\, (r(\sigma))^\varepsilon \leq H_{n,s} + C\varepsilon.$$

Letting now $\varepsilon \to 0$ (recall that $\sigma \in (0,1)$ is an arbitrary given number), we find

$$(1-\sigma)\lambda_0 \leq H_{n,s}.$$

Finally, since this can be done for each $\sigma \in (0,1)$, we deduce that

$$\lambda_0 \leq H_{n,s},$$

a contradiction. □

Remark 3.3. Note that in our proof of Theorem 1.1 the exterior condition $u \equiv 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega$ plays no role. Thus, the same result holds true for (1.1) with any other exterior condition $u = g$ in $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega$.

On the other hand, note that the nonlinearity $f(u) = e^u$ plays a very important role in our proof. Indeed, to establish (3.2) we have strongly used that $f'(u) = f(u)$, since we combined the stability condition (in which $f'(u)$ appears) with the equation (in which only $f(u)$ appears). It seems difficult to extend our proof to the case of more general nonlinearities. Even for the powers $f(u) = (1+u)^p$, it is not clear how to do it.

Acknowledgements

The author thanks Xavier Cabré for his guidance and useful discussions on the topic of this paper.

References

[1] H. Berestycki, L. Nirenberg, *On the method of moving planes and the sliding method*, B. Braz. Math. Soc. 22 (1991), 1-37.
[2] H. Brezis, J. L. Vázquez, *Blow-up solutions of some nonlinear elliptic problems*, Rev. Mat. Univ. Complut. Madrid 10 (1997), 443-469.
[3] X. Cabré, *Regularity of minimizers of semilinear elliptic problems up to dimension four*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 63 (2010), 1362-1380.
[4] X. Cabré, A. Capella, *Regularity of radial minimizers and extremal solutions of semi-linear elliptic equations*, J. Funct. Anal. 238 (2006), 709-733.
[5] X. Cabré, X. Ros-Oton, *Regularity of stable solutions up to dimension 7 in domains of double revolution*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations, 38 (2013), 135-154.
[6] A. Capella, J. Davila, L. Dupaigne, Y. Sire, *Regularity of radial extremal solutions for some non local semilinear equations*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations 36 (2011), 1353-1384.
[7] M. G. Crandall, P. H. Rabinowitz, *Some continuation and variational methods for positive solutions of nonlinear elliptic eigenvalue problems*, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. 58 (1975), 207-218.
[8] J. Dávila, L. Dupaigne, I. Guerra, M. Montenegro, *Stable solutions for the bilaplacian with exponential nonlinearity*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. 39 (2007), 565-592.
[9] J. Dávila, L. Dupaigne, M. Montenegro, *The extremal solution in a boundary reaction problem*, Commun. Pure Appl. Anal. 7 (2008), 795-817.
[10] J. Davila, L. Dupaigne, K. Wang, J. Wei, *A monotonicity formula and a Liouville type theorem for a fourth order supercritical problem*, preprint arXiv (Mar. 2013).
[11] J. Davila, L. Dupaigne, J. Wei, *On the fractional Lane-Emden equation*, forthcoming.
[12] L. Dupaigne, *Stable Solutions to Elliptic Partial Differential Equations*, Chapman & Hall, 2011.

[13] H. Fujita, *On the nonlinear equations* $\Delta u + e^u = 0$ *and* $\partial_t v = \Delta v + e^v$, Bull. A.M.S. 75 (1969), 132-135.

[14] I.M. Gelfand, *Some problems in the theory of quasilinear equations*, Section 15, due to G.I. Barenblatt, American Math. Soc. Transl. 29 (1963), 295-381; Russian original: Uspekhi Mat. Nauk 14 (1959), 87-158.

[15] S. Jarohs, T. Weth, *Asymptotic symmetry for a class of nonlinear fractional reaction-diffusion equations*, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. 34 (2014), 2581-2615.

[16] D. D. Joseph, T. S. Lundgren, *Quasilinear Dirichlet problems driven by positive sources*, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. 49 (1973), 241-269.

[17] E. H. Lieb, M. Loss, *Analysis*, Second edition, Graduate Studies in Mathematics 14, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2001.

[18] J. Liouville, *Sur l'équation aux differences partielles* $\frac{d^2 \log \lambda}{du\, dv} \pm \frac{\lambda}{2a^2} = 0$, J. Math. Pures Appl. 18 (1853), 71-72.

[19] F. Mignot, J. P. Puel, *Solution radiale singulière de* $-\Delta u = e^u$, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris 307 (1988), 379-382.

[20] K. Nagasaki, T. Suzuki, *Spectral and related properties about the Emden-Fowler equation* $-\Delta u = \lambda e^u$ *on circular domains*, Math. Ann. 299 (1994), 1-15.

[21] I. Peral, J. L. Vazquez, *On the stability and instability of the semilinear heat equation with exponential reaction term*, Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal. 129 (1995), 201-224.

[22] X. Ros-Oton, J. Serra, *The Dirichlet problem for the fractional Laplacian: regularity up to the boundary*, J. Math. Pures Appl., to appear.

[23] X. Ros-Oton, J. Serra, *The extremal solution for the fractional Laplacian*, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations, to appear.

[24] S. Villegas, *Boundedness of the extremal solutions in dimension 4*, Adv. Math. 235 (2013), 126-133.

Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya, Departament de Matemàtica Aplicada I, Diagonal 647, 08028 Barcelona, Spain

E-mail address: xavier.ros.oton@upc.edu